



Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act

**Annual Report
March 2008**

**California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Corrections Standards Authority**

Juvenile Justice

Crime Prevention Act

Annual Report to the Legislature

March 2008

**Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95811
http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/CSA/index.html**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

James E. Tilton, *Secretary*

Scott Kernan

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Adult Offenders*

John Ingrassia

*Administrator
Local Detention Facility
San Diego County Sheriff's Department*

Bernard Warner

*Manager/Administrator,
State Correctional Facility for Juvenile Offenders*

Mimi H. Silbert, Ph.D.

*Administrator
Local Community-Based Correctional Program
Delancey Street Foundation, San Francisco*

Ed Prieto

*Sheriff (county under 200,000 pop.)
County of Yolo*

David Bacigalupo

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Gary Penrod

*Sheriff (county over 200,000 pop.)
County of San Bernardino*

Carol Biondi

Public Member

William Powers

*County Supervisor
County of Plumas*

Robert Hernandez

*Subordinate Officer of the Secretary of the
Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*

Linda Penner

*Chief Probation Officer
(county over 200,000 pop.)
County of Fresno*

Kim Petersen

*Public Member
Represents Interests of Crime Victims*

Adele Arnold

*Chief Probation Officer
(county under 200,000 pop.)*

Max L. Scott

*Representative
Community-Based Youth Service Organization*

Cleotha Adams

*Rank and File Representative
Deputy Sheriff*

Pamela M. Gilyard

*Rank and File Representative
Juvenile Probation Officer*

Karrie Eckhardt

*Rank and File Representative
State Parole Officer*

Travis Townsy

*Rank and File Representative
State Adult Correctional Facility*

Staff

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

C. Scott Harris, *Executive Director*

CORRECTIONS PLANNING AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

Marlon Yarber, *Deputy Director*

STANDARDS AND TRAINING FOR CORRECTIONS DIVISION

Debbie Rives, *Deputy Director*

FACILITIES STANDARDS AND OPERATIONS DIVISION

Gary Wion, *Deputy Director*

COUNTY FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION DIVISION

Robert J. Takeshta, *Deputy Director*

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1-2
--------------------------	-----

An Overview of the Program	3-5
-----------------------------------	-----

- Local Planning Process
- Program Evaluation
- Program Administration

Statewide Evaluation	6-7
-----------------------------	-----

- Program Expenditures
- Mandated Outcomes
- Local Outcomes

County Program Highlights	8-12
----------------------------------	------

Appendices

- A. Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary
- B. Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs
- C. Change in County Arrest Rate

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) supports probation programs that have proven effective in reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and young offenders. In 2006-07 the JJCPA supported 172 programs implemented by counties to address locally identified needs in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime.

The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is responsible for administering the JJCPA and must submit annual reports to the Legislature on: 1) the local planning process; 2) program expenditures; and 3) six mandated juvenile justice outcomes (Government Code Section 30061[4]). This sixth annual report addresses each of these issues.

Local Planning Process: The JJCPA required counties to establish and maintain a multi-agency Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and updating a comprehensive plan that documents the condition of the local juvenile justice system and outlines proposed efforts to fill identified service gaps. Chief Probation Officers and other JJCC members report a great deal of satisfaction with the enhanced communication, coordination, and collaboration resulting from this planning process.

Program Expenditures: By June 30, 2007, the 56 counties participating in the JJCPA had expended or encumbered 99.8 percent of the \$114.8 million allocated for the sixth year of the initiative. Local programs served 95,641 at-risk youth and young offenders in 2006-07, for a per capita cost to the State of \$1,198.23. As explained later in the report, changes in the timing and amount of the JJCPA allocation during the current year most likely contributed to an increase in per capita costs from the previous fiscal year. Nevertheless, current year per capita costs are essentially unchanged from the first year of the initiative (\$1,201.53), and it is reasonable to expect that annual per capita costs will be lower in 2007-08.

Juvenile Justice Outcomes: The data submitted by counties for 2006-07 indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have a positive impact on juvenile crime and delinquency in communities throughout California. This is evident in the results for the mandated juvenile justice outcomes as well as education outcomes tracked by a number of counties. For example:

- Youth participating in JJCPA programs were arrested for new offenses and incarcerated at significantly lower rates than youth in a comparable reference group.
- JJCPA participants successfully completed probation at significantly higher rates than youth in the comparison group.
- JJCPA youth attended a significantly greater percentage of school days, achieved significantly higher grade point averages, and were significantly less likely to be suspended from school than reference group youth.

Because the efforts supported by the JJCPA are collaborative and build upon strategies that have proven successful in the past, CSA staff believes this initiative will continue making a positive impact on public safety well into the future.

Statistically significant results were reported for three of the six mandated outcomes-arrest, incarceration, and probation violation rates. The arrest rate average for program participants in 132 of the programs was reported at 25.1 percent, in comparison to the reference group arrest rate at 32.7 percent. For 134 of the programs, the incarceration rate average was 22.7 percent for program participants, and 26.5 percent for the reference group. Lastly, for 111 of the programs, the average rate of completion of probation was 25.1 percent for program participants, and 21.2 percent for the reference group.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes, some of which are common enough to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. Outcome results for 16 programs indicated an average of 86.1 percent of school days attended by program youth, as compared to 76.4 percent of school days attended by the reference group. For 9 programs, there were fewer average suspensions by program youth; (17.2 percent) than reference group youth (32.6 percent). Finally, for 15 of the programs, the average grade point average for program youth was 2.04 in comparison to 1.77 for the youth in the reference group.

An Overview of the Program

The Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) program was created by the Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Chapter 353). The Act created a stable funding source for local juvenile justice programs aimed at curbing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth.

The JJCPA involves a partnership between the state of California, 56¹ counties and numerous community-based organizations to enhance public safety by reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Local officials and stakeholders determine where to direct resources through an interagency planning process; the State appropriates funds, which the Controller's Office distributes to counties on a per capita basis; and community-based organizations play a critical role in delivering services. It is a partnership that recognizes the need for juvenile justice resources and the value of local discretion and multi-agency collaboration in addressing the problem of juvenile crime in our communities.

Local Planning Process

State policies have increasingly recognized the need to strengthen the local juvenile justice system and its array of alternatives and graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders through a comprehensive local planning process that requires probation departments to coordinate their activities with other key stakeholders.

The programs funded by the JJCPA address a continuum of responses to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders—prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment and incarceration—and respond to specific problems associated with these populations in each county.

To receive the initial JJCPA allocation, counties had to develop a comprehensive multi-agency juvenile justice plan that included an assessment of existing resources targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders and their families as well as a local action strategy for addressing identified gaps in the continuum of responses to juvenile crime and delinquency. Each year, counties must update and, as needed, modify their plan, which must be approved by staff of the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) before funds can be expended.²

To help ensure coordination and collaboration among the various local agencies serving at-risk youth and young offenders, the JJCPA entrusted development and modification of the plan to a Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) chaired by the county's Chief Probation Officer and comprised of representatives of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, the board of supervisors, social services, education, mental health and community-based organizations. The JJCCs typically meet monthly or quarterly to review program progress and evaluation data.

Chief Probation Officers and other JJCC members continue to report a great deal of satisfaction with the JJCPA planning process, noting that it maximizes their ability to implement or expand programs tailored to the specific populations and needs of their local jurisdiction. In addition to pointing out that juvenile justice planning has become more strategic, integrated and

¹ Alpine and Sierra Counties chose not to participate in this program.

² Prior to the July 2005 reorganization of the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency, the CSA was known as the Board of Corrections.

outcome-oriented, JJCC members have underscored the value of sharing information regarding youth programs across the many disciplines involved in the JJCPA programs.

Program Funding

Funding for JJCPA changed significantly during the program year. In the past, counties received their JJCPA allocation in October for program expenditures occurring the following fiscal year (i.e., nine months in advance). Thus, counties were able to bank and earn interest on the allocation, with the earned interest used for program expenditures in the subsequent fiscal year.

In 2005-06, as part of its budget reduction strategy, the Legislature authorized \$26.1 million for JJCPA program expenditures during the first quarter of fiscal year 2006-07. This was followed by the usual allocation in October, but with the expenditure of these funds to commence immediately (i.e., October 1), and with counties expected to hold 25 percent of the allocation in reserve for program expenditures that occur in the first quarter of fiscal year 2007-08.

In addition to this change in the funding cycle, the 2006-07 allocation was \$119 million—an increase of \$19 million from the previous year—thus restoring funding to a level commensurate with the early years of the program. Some counties elected to use the additional funds to add new programs mid-year, and statewide the number of programs increased from 162 to 172. However, due to the normal start-up costs and elapsed time associated with implementing a new program, many of these new programs had notable program expenditures but served very few youth in fiscal year 2006-07. At the statewide level, this most likely contributed to the overall increase in the per capita cost to the State from \$937.14 in fiscal year 2005-06 to \$1,198.23 in fiscal year 2006-07. However, even with this increase, the 2006-07 per capita cost is essentially unchanged from the first year of the program of \$1,201.53. Thus, in this the sixth year of the program, annual per capita costs are essentially unchanged from year one. Further, as the new programs reach capacity and begin to serve a greater number of youth, it is reasonable to expect that statewide per capita costs will decrease in 2007-08 as compared to 2006-07.

Program Evaluation

JJCPA requires that funded programs be modeled on evidence-based strategies that have proven effective in curbing juvenile delinquency. The JJCPA also requires counties to collect and report information on annual program expenditures and juvenile justice outcomes. At the local level, these evaluation activities enable stakeholders to assess progress toward desired goals, refine their programs, and target available resources. These evaluation efforts also enable the Legislature to monitor the investment the State has made in the JJCPA and assess its overall impact on juvenile crime and delinquency.

Counties are statutorily required to report data for six mandated outcomes: 1) arrest rate; 2) incarceration rate; 3) probation violation rate; 4) probation completion rate; 5) restitution completion rate; and 6) community service completion rate. However, some of these outcomes are not applicable to prevention programs and/or similar efforts directed towards at-risk juveniles. For example, a truancy prevention program serving primarily middle-school students would not be expected to have an impact on the completion of probation rate. Therefore, counties report outcome data only on those variables applicable to their programs.

In addition to the mandated outcomes, many counties track and report on local outcomes specific to their individual programs. Some of the local outcomes are related to education and may involve tracking school attendance, grade point averages, and school behavior reports.

Program Administration

The Legislature charged the CSA with administering the JJCPA and reporting annually on: 1) the overall effectiveness of the local planning process; 2) program expenditures for each county; and 3) the six statutorily mandated outcome variables.

In administering the JJCPA, CSA staff has worked closely with the chairs and members of the JJCCs in both developing and updating their comprehensive juvenile justice plan, which must be approved by the CSA each year before counties may begin spending their JJCPA funds. This effort includes extensive technical assistance, at the request of counties, in identifying and documenting programmatic strategies that have proven effective in reducing juvenile crime, determining appropriate evaluation designs for the proposed programs, and problem-solving on issues related to program implementation and evaluation.

CSA staff also monitor program activities and evaluation results to ensure that counties are complying with statutory requirements and to offer suggestions for continued improvement in the delivery of effective corrections programs.

Statewide Evaluation

Program Expenditures

The counties participating in the JJCPA program expended 99.8 percent of the \$114,846,602 allocated in 2006-07 (see Appendix A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary). Counties also spent \$3,559,041 in interest earned on State funds and \$18,686,087 in non-JJCPA funds to support program activities. Although not required, the infusion of local resources demonstrates the counties' commitment to the goals of the JJCPA and significantly leverages the State's investment in deterring youth from criminal activity. A total of 95,641 minors participated in the 172 JJCPA programs in 2006-07, which translates into an average per capita cost to the State (JJCPA funds) of \$1,198.23 (see Appendix B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs).

Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As required by law, the statewide evaluation of the JJCPA focuses on six legislatively mandated outcomes: arrest, incarceration, and probation violation rates; and probation, restitution, and community service completion rates. The data collected by counties on these six variables clearly indicate that the JJCPA programs continue to have the intended effect of curbing juvenile crime and delinquency in California.³

Outcome results reported by counties for fiscal year 2006-07 on juveniles who completed the full evaluation period indicate statistically significant differences in the desired direction on three of the six mandated outcomes. These results are summarized in Table A.

TABLE A
Statistically Significant Results on Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs with Available Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
Arrest Rate	132	25.1%	32.7%
Incarceration Rate	134	22.7%	26.5%
Completion of Probation	111	25.1%	21.2%

For one of the three remaining mandated outcomes—completion of community service—the results were in the desired direction but not statistically significant, with an average of 41.5 percent of program juveniles completing community service compared to 39.1 percent of reference group juveniles (66 programs).

³ For most outcomes, counties assess their progress by comparing the results for participating minors and a reference group (i.e., participants prior to entering the program, prior program participants, juveniles comparable to those who received program services, or some other external reference group). The length and timing of the evaluation periods vary from program to program. For example, one program might compare the arrest rate of participants for the three-month period prior to program entry with their arrest rate during the first three months of the program, whereas another program might use a longer time period and compare the arrest rate prior to program entry with the arrest rate following program exit.

As was the case in fiscal year 2005-06, results for the mandated outcome—completion of restitution—were not statistically significant, with the average completion rate of 28.1 percent for program juveniles being slightly lower than the 29.0 percent completion rate for reference group juveniles (67 programs).

Overall results for the remaining mandated outcome—probation violation rate—were also consistent with findings in previous years in that the average rates were approximately the same for the two groups in the 100 programs for which results were available (28.2 percent for the program juveniles; 30.6 percent for the reference group juveniles). As noted in previous reports, these findings are not surprising given that many of the programs involve increased levels of supervision, thus increasing the likelihood of detecting probation violations when they occur. Further, in those programs where the expectation was that there would be fewer probation violations by program juveniles (54 programs), this was found to be the case (27.8 percent of program juveniles; 32.1 percent of reference group juveniles).

Results for arrest rate were also positive in counties opting to use a different method to measure program impact (average number vs. percentage), with the average number of arrests being significantly lower for program juveniles (20 programs reporting results).

The enabling legislation also requires that all counties specify a goal or expectation for change in the annual countywide arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles age 10 to 17. Each county also specifies a baseline (i.e., reference) year to which companies are made. In most cases, the baseline for this reporting period is 2005. Results for this measure are presented for the most recent reporting year (2006) in Appendix C.

A total of 24 counties expected the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles to go down; 24 counties expected no change; and 8 counties expected the rate to go up. The rate went down in just 7 (29.2 percent) of the counties that expected a decline, and in 12 (50 percent) of the counties that expected no change. Overall, the arrest rate per 100,000 juveniles increased from 4,869 in 2005 to 5,168 in 2006 for the 56 counties that participated in the JJCPA, marking the first time that there was not a year-to-year decline since the inception of JJCPA.

Education Outcomes

In addition to the mandated outcomes, the JJCPA programs report on many local outcomes, some of which are common to a sufficient number of programs to permit the aggregation of findings. The most widely reported local outcomes pertain to conduct and achievement in school. As shown in Table B, the results for these outcomes are quite impressive. Program juveniles, on average, attended a significantly greater percentage of school days, achieved significantly higher grade point averages, and were significantly less likely to be suspended from school than reference group juveniles.

TABLE B
Summary of Local Results on Education Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Number of Programs Reporting Results	Average	
		Program Juveniles	Reference Group
% School Days Attended	16	86.1%	76.4%
% Suspended from School	9	17.2%	32.6%
Grade Point Average	15	2.04	1.77

County Program Highlights

During the 2006-07 fiscal year there were 172 programs in the 56 participating counties. The JJCPA recognizes the importance of a continuum of responses to the complex problem of juvenile crime and delinquency—from prevention, intervention, and supervision to treatment and incapacitation (i.e., commitment to a local juvenile facility). The local planning and decision-making process inherent in JJCPA resulted in the implementation, improvement and/or expansion of a variety of juvenile justice efforts, as evidenced by the following examples.

Prevention/Early Intervention

The following programs, typically referred to as prevention/early intervention programs, focus on keeping at-risk youth from entering the juvenile justice system and preventing first-time offenders from further involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Madera County's Stop Truancy Operation Program (STOP) is a five-step program that involves a series of graduated responses to unexcused school absences and chronic truancy. Truancy is often seen as a precursor to delinquent and criminal behavior. Additionally, many studies have demonstrated a correlation between failing to obtain a high school diploma and an increased likelihood that a minor will be involved in the criminal justice system. The STOP program is a collaborative multi-agency approach that involves educators, probation officers, and the local district attorney's office staff in truancy mediation teams. As working parents may not be aware that their children are missing school, the first step of the program consists of the school sending a certified letter to the parent/guardian detailing the minor's unexcused absences.

The second step of the STOP program involves a home visit to the minor's residence by a probation officer. The probation officer explains the relevant Penal Code and Education Code laws to the parent/guardian to ensure that they understand the legal requirements of school attendance. Additionally, an assessment of the student and family is completed in case further intervention is warranted. Program findings have indicated that the majority of youth will require no additional intervention beyond this step.

For minors who continue to be truant, the third step is a certified letter from the district attorney's office mandating a meeting between the student, parent/guardian, and the multi-agency truancy mediation team. At the meeting the truancy mediation team discusses the legal responsibilities of the parent/guardian and the family is provided information on relevant resources in the community.

The fourth step of the STOP program involves a referral for the student to informal probation and a School Attendance Review Board (SARB) hearing. Additionally, the family may face a possible reduction in aid if they are involved in the CalWORKS program. A contractual agreement with the student and parent/guardian is developed to mandate directed services to assist the family.

The final step of the STOP program is a referral for a 601 Welfare and Institution Code petition and, if necessary, the prosecution of the youth and the parent/guardian.

The STOP program had a total of 174 participants for the 2006-07 year. Of the 174 minors, 140 successfully completed the program. Of the 34 minors who did not complete the program,

11 transferred to a school that was not served by the STOP program and 8 minors became 602 wards of the court for other reasons.

Nevada County uses some JJCPA funds to operate an Emergency 601 Bed Space program. The program serves youth who are presently under the jurisdiction of the court as runaways, truants, or are out of the control of their parents. Local law enforcement officers frequently encounter juvenile runaways and 601 minors who can not be immediately placed with a relative. Nevada County does not have a receiving home for minors. The emergency bed program, using the Children's System of Care model, allows law enforcement the ability to place minors at licensed foster homes and foster care facilities. The program provides respite care for crisis intervention and temporary emergency shelter. Emergency bed space is set aside with contracted foster families so that youth in crisis are provided with a safe place to stay, undergo assessment for barriers to remaining at home, and can be linked with community services. The goal is successful reunification with families. JJCPA funds help to pay for a coordinator who arranges emergency bed space and case management to provide follow up service provider referrals.

The Emergency 601 Bed Space program also provides for the return of out-of-county runaways. Nevada County is in a direct route along Interstate 80 between the cities of Sacramento and Reno. As a result of this geographic placement, out-of-county runaway minors are frequently picked up by Nevada County law enforcement as the minors transit through the county. This program assists local law enforcement officers by greatly decreasing the amount of time that officers must spend supervising minors until a placement can be found. Previously, Nevada County law enforcement officers had to transport runaway minors to receiving homes in neighboring counties, or expend precious law enforcement time attempting to contact a responsible relative. This program ensures that law enforcement officers can place the minors in a secure location quickly so that they can return to patrol.

By providing intensive services to high-risk youth within the community, the program is also able to lend assistance to resolving the precipitating issues resulting in runaway behavior. In doing so, the program is able to provide emergency bed space (safe housing, meals, clean clothes, and shower), active school involvement, and referrals to counseling and/or drug treatment. The program works in coordination with various local community agencies to address the individual needs of the youth and families (e.g., Reach Counseling Center, Community Recovery Resources, Social Services, Behavioral Health, etc).

Despite experiencing a staffing vacancy during part of the year, the program was able to respond to all crisis calls. Calls for service were prioritized based upon greatest need. During 2006-07, 56 minors participated in the program with 33 minors completing the program, 10 minors not completing, and 13 remaining in progress.

Intervention and Supervision

The following programs focus on providing comprehensive intervention and supervision services for juvenile offenders in order to facilitate the minors' successful completion of probation and help them avoid further criminal behavior.

Tuolumne County initiated school/probation officer teams during the 2006-07 program year. Probation officers work with school staff and law enforcement resource officers currently assigned to the designated schools. Probation officers supervise each juvenile court ward attending their assigned school. The Probation officers make sure that the wards are complying with their conditions of probation including school attendance, proper behavior, and drug testing. Probation

officers also participate in the School Attendance Review Board (SARB) and school prevention programs addressing truancy. The use of probation officers on school campuses has been a successful evidence-based JJCPA program that has been utilized by other counties.

The new School Probation Officer Teams (SPOT) have been successful in Tuolumne County. A total of 67 youth participated in the SPOT program during the 2006-07 fiscal year. Of the 67 program participants, approximately 19 percent did not complete the program due to inadequate performance or unacceptable behavior, expulsion or departure from the area. About 24 percent of the participants remain in progress and will continue to receive services into the next program year. The SPOT program reported that over half of all participating program minors (about 54 percent) successfully completed the program requirements.

The SPOT program reported a significant decrease in the arrest rate for participating program minors. Program participants were arrested an average of 1.84 times prior to program entry. However, incidents of arrests decreased to an average of less than 1 time (.97 times) during the program treatment period. Of the 67 youth who participated in the program, 82 percent were arrested at least once prior to treatment. During the treatment period, only 49 percent of program participants were rearrested at least once, despite the increased contact with law enforcement and probation officers.

Lake County's Project Return provides multi-disciplinary services to youth and their families through an interagency team that is comprised of probation officers, mental health providers, school district representatives, and other professionals identified by team members. Project Return services include: interagency placement reviews and transitional planning for youth; intensive probation supervision; school-based counseling; substance abuse prevention and treatment services; and community service opportunities.

The Project Return program provides services to youth across the broad spectrum of probation interventions, including minors in court-ordered placements. The program works to bring these minors out of placements and effectively transition back into the community. These youth typically have more severe needs than the general juvenile probation population. However, even the group of placement minors reported a 57.6 percent decrease in arrests, a 37.5 percent decrease in total incarcerations, and a 51.7 percent decrease in the number of days of incarceration.

The Youth for Seniors community service program continues to be a very positive component of Project Return. Youth for Seniors is a program of the probation department which is operated by Mendo-Lake Alternative Services, Inc. (MLAS). MLAS works with six local senior centers, code enforcement officers, the Department of Social Services, and others to identify seniors who need yard work completed (e.g., brush and weeds cut and removed, tree trimming, clearing, etc). Seniors who are too frail to do their own yard work or who can no longer afford the cost of paying someone else for these services utilize the program. Some seniors have faced significant fines for failing to clear weeds and brush from their property or are in danger of losing their homes due to noncompliance with local codes.

Youth for Seniors creates community service opportunities for Project Return youth and provides vital support for local seniors. Youth are proud of making a visible contribution to the community. The intergenerational bonding fostered by the program helps youth become vested in their neighborhoods and the community at large. The program has reported that the youth enjoy this unique means of completing their community service, with the result that the mandatory outcome of community service completed has been increased.

During 2006-07 there were 111 minors involved in the Project Return program. The program reports that 16 minors completed all aspects of the program, 71 minors remain in progress, and only 24 minors did not complete the program.

Treatment and Incapacitation

The following programs focus on providing juvenile offenders treatment services in a secure detention setting and aftercare/transition services.

Napa County's Success Through Acting Responsibly (STAR) program serves youth who have been made wards of the court. The primary target population is youth who have been detained in juvenile hall. The purpose of the STAR program is to increase the competencies of juvenile probationers and their families so that youth successfully complete probation, do not reoffend, and attempt to repair the harm they might have done to a victim. The program is staffed with two deputy probation officers and one social worker who works under a memorandum of understanding with Napa County Health and Human Services.

Youth participating in the STAR program receive referrals from probation officers for a variety of programs and services based upon the use of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), a comprehensive case management system designed to help probation staff assess the needs of all juvenile offenders. Over the past year, the Napa County Probation Department implemented the use of the YLS/CMI risk/needs assessment. Additionally, to facilitate the use of YLS/CMI instrument, all juvenile probation staff attended training in the use of the YLS /CMI tool and how to incorporate its findings into a youth's case plan.

Since the program focuses on minors who have been detained in juvenile hall, a variety of treatment services have been developed for incarcerated youth including:

- An initial mental health and substance abuse screening of all detainees soon after they are admitted into juvenile hall, using the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument. This instrument is administered by the STAR Social Worker.
- Aggression Replacement Training (ART), which is a 30-session evidence-based program group, developed specifically for institutional settings. This program is designed for adolescents and teaches them pro-social and interpersonal skills, alternative methods to aggressive behavior, techniques to utilize when provoked, values related to respecting others, and anger management.
- The Life Skills Program offers ongoing open-ended programming that focuses on identifying, understanding, and practicing social, communication and decision-making skills in order to aid youth in dealing with issues related to peer pressure.

During the 2006-07 fiscal year the STAR program served 226 youth. Of those youth, 146 completed the program; 38 were unsuccessful and 42 remain in progress. The YLS/CMI assessment tool was completed on 143 youth to identify their risk level for reoffense and to assess their level of need regarding the risk factors that should be prioritized for intervention.

The STAR program has benefited from the Napa County Probation Department's focus on developing evidenced based practices. The department has contracted with nationally recognized experts to provide training for all juvenile probation staff in evidence-based practices and

motivational interviewing techniques. Additionally, the Star program social worker has attended Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART) training.

Solano County's Detention Multidisciplinary Team is a program targeted at youth who are admitted to detention or who have extended stays in detention. The Detention Multidisciplinary Team is comprised of a detention release plan coordinator (expediter), an accelerated citation officer, a mental health clinician, and three mental health specialists. The efficacy of multidisciplinary teams and wraparound style services has been well established in JJCPA programs as an evidence-based best practice for dealing with the multitude of needs of incarcerated youth. One of the unique factors of the Solano County program is the inclusion of a release plan coordinator who is designated as the expeditor. The team has a staff specifically assigned to develop detention release plans and to literally "expedite" the release of minors held in detention. The release plan coordinator works with the assigned mental health staff to develop a post-release plan that includes continued mental health services in the community for the minor.

The Detention Multidisciplinary Team program has three primary objectives. First, the program seeks to reduce the number of short stays in detention. Secondly, the program is designed to significantly increase the mental health services available to minors in detention (and available to minors in the community following release). Finally, a primary objective of the program is to reduce the overall population of minors in detention.

One of the primary aspects of the program is the inclusion of an accelerated citation officer. The program has reported that the average time to process a citation from receipt by probation until date of disposition is 37.6 days, which is a significant decrease from the 179.8 days during the 1997-2000 period of time (reference group.). For the 2006-07 program year only 15.2 percent of program participants were referred to the district attorney's office, thus eliminating much of the delay that was experienced in previous years. The amount of time spent in processing the citations is representative of the fact that 77.2 percent of program participants were placed on suspended action by the probation department.

During the 2006-07 program year, 1,283 minors participated in the program. The program reported that 1,128 minors completed the program, 91 remain in progress, and only 64 minors did not complete the program.

APPENDIX A: Statewide Allocation and Expenditure Summary ⁴

County	State Fund Expenditures	Interest Expenditures	Non-JJCPA Fund Expenditures	Total Expenditures	State Fund Allocations
Alameda	\$4,675,472	\$33,000	\$800,000	\$5,508,472	\$4,675,472
Amador	\$117,707	\$1,059	\$35,395	\$154,161	\$117,707
Butte	\$663,404	\$0	\$393,193	\$1,056,597	\$663,404
Calaveras	\$134,864	\$5,676	\$0	\$140,540	\$140,690
Colusa	\$55,421	\$5,000	\$0	\$60,421	\$66,180
Contra Costa	\$3,182,052	\$0	\$1,304,102	\$4,486,154	\$3,182,052
Del Norte	\$90,209	\$0	\$69,945	\$160,154	\$90,209
El Dorado	\$543,745	\$18,351	\$30,588	\$592,684	\$543,745
Fresno	\$2,774,604	\$114,322	\$0	\$2,888,926	\$2,774,604
Glenn	\$88,413	\$121	\$0	\$88,534	\$88,413
Humboldt	\$409,599	\$10,839	\$813,318	\$1,233,756	\$409,599
Imperial	\$512,560	\$7,489	\$0	\$520,049	\$512,560
Inyo	\$57,396	\$0	\$0	\$57,396	\$57,396
Kern	\$2,396,469	\$102,921	\$37,707	\$2,537,097	\$2,396,469
Kings	\$344,212	\$49,749	\$0	\$393,961	\$455,417
Lake	\$180,352	\$5,912	\$28,199	\$214,463	\$197,934
Lassen	\$109,797	\$0	\$450,619	\$560,416	\$109,797
Los Angeles	\$31,717,366	\$1,416,568	\$0	\$33,133,934	\$31,717,366
Madera	\$422,761	\$0	\$0	\$422,761	\$444,819
Marin	\$784,002	\$0	\$0	\$784,002	\$784,002
Mariposa	\$56,258	\$0	\$0	\$56,258	\$56,258
Mendocino	\$279,779	\$10,550	\$0	\$290,329	\$279,779
Merced	\$759,570	\$20,741	\$0	\$780,311	\$759,570
Modoc	\$26,597	\$200	\$10,000	\$36,797	\$30,367
Mono	\$42,086	\$0	\$1,430	\$43,516	\$42,086
Monterey	\$1,315,927	\$57,450	\$1,315,434	\$2,688,811	\$1,315,927
Napa	\$415,568	\$5,876	\$0	\$421,444	\$415,568
Nevada	\$266,862	\$9,244	\$0	\$276,106	\$309,127
Orange	\$9,504,232	\$385,191	\$1,444,945	\$11,334,368	\$9,504,232
Placer	\$972,631	\$20,000	\$0	\$992,631	\$972,631
Plumas	\$55,711	\$0	\$48,900	\$104,611	\$66,263
Riverside	\$5,982,493	\$13,749	\$60,915	\$6,057,157	\$5,995,952
Sacramento	\$4,280,202	\$178,372	\$1,778,756	\$6,237,330	\$4,280,202
San Benito	\$177,344	\$7,014	\$0	\$184,358	\$178,455
San Bernardino	\$6,136,724	\$130,364	\$221,766	\$6,488,854	\$6,136,724
San Diego	\$9,487,101	\$273,588	\$5,953,218	\$15,713,907	\$9,487,101
San Francisco	\$2,473,887	\$0	\$0	\$2,473,887	\$2,473,887
San Joaquin	\$2,059,154	\$0	\$0	\$2,059,154	\$2,059,154
San Luis Obispo	\$813,501	\$30,658	\$306,122	\$1,150,281	\$813,501
San Mateo	\$2,242,108	\$101,168	\$1,934,075	\$4,277,351	\$2,242,108
Santa Barbara	\$1,304,122	\$36,518	\$780,704	\$2,121,344	\$1,304,122
Santa Clara	\$5,482,223	\$216,052	\$0	\$5,698,275	\$5,482,223
Santa Cruz	\$811,025	\$6,885	\$83,769	\$901,679	\$811,025
Shasta	\$559,751	\$17,810	\$59,129	\$636,690	\$559,751
Siskiyou	\$135,315	\$5,060	\$0	\$140,375	\$142,685
Solano	\$1,308,732	\$43,924	\$0	\$1,352,656	\$1,308,732
Sonoma	\$1,485,306	\$36,914	\$0	\$1,522,220	\$1,485,306
Stanislaus	\$1,586,077	\$30,638	\$220,000	\$1,836,715	\$1,586,077
Sutter	\$281,465	\$7,818	\$92,248	\$381,531	\$281,465
Tehama	\$189,506	\$0	\$0	\$189,506	\$189,506
Trinity	\$43,240	\$1,594	\$0	\$44,834	\$43,240
Tulare	\$1,295,125	\$35,491	\$0	\$1,330,616	\$1,295,125
Tuolumne	\$180,535	\$6,600	\$0	\$187,135	\$180,535
Ventura	\$2,528,324	\$88,877	\$411,610	\$3,028,811	\$2,528,324
Yolo	\$587,674	\$9,688	\$0	\$597,362	\$587,674
Yuba	\$214,085	\$0	\$0	\$214,085	\$214,085
TOTALS	\$114,600,645	\$3,559,041	\$18,686,087	\$136,845,773	\$114,846,602

⁴ Alpine and Sierra counties did not apply for JJCPA funding. Allocation amounts of \$3,859 (Alpine County) and \$10,868 (Sierra County) would have been available.

APPENDIX B: Statewide Summary of Average Per Capita Program Costs

County	Programs	Program	Average Per Capita Costs	
		Participants	JJCPA Funds	All Funds
Alameda	1	1,287	\$3,632.85	\$4,280.09
Amador	1	105	\$1,121.02	\$1,468.20
Butte	4	591	\$1,122.51	\$1,787.81
Calaveras	2	90	\$1,498.49	\$1,561.56
Colusa	1	120	\$461.84	\$503.51
Contra Costa	4	1,872	\$1,699.81	\$2,396.45
Del Norte	1	94	\$959.67	\$1,703.77
El Dorado	1	444	\$1,224.65	\$1,334.87
Fresno	1	699	\$3,969.39	\$4,132.94
Glenn	1	16	\$5,525.81	\$5,533.38
Humboldt	2	374	\$1,095.18	\$3,298.81
Imperial	3	1,761	\$291.06	\$295.31
Inyo	2	707	\$83.64	\$83.64
Kern	2	484	\$4,951.38	\$5,241.94
Kings	1	346	\$994.83	\$1,138.62
Lake	1	111	\$1,624.79	\$1,932.10
Lassen	3	923	\$118.96	\$607.17
Los Angeles	14	26,602	\$1,192.29	\$1,245.54
Madera	1	174	\$2,429.66	\$2,429.66
Marin	3	323	\$2,427.25	\$2,427.25
Mariposa	1	225	\$250.04	\$250.04
Mendocino	2	284	\$985.14	\$1,022.29
Merced	1	178	\$4,267.25	\$4,383.77
Modoc	1	11	\$2,417.91	\$3,345.18
Mono	1	23	\$1,829.83	\$1,892.00
Monterey	8	5,268	\$249.80	\$510.40
Napa	2	243	\$1,710.16	\$1,734.34
Nevada	3	185	\$1,442.50	\$1,492.46
Orange	10	3,496	\$2,718.60	\$3,242.10
Placer	3	1,275	\$762.85	\$778.53
Plumas	1	127	\$438.67	\$823.71
Riverside	2	1,220	\$4,903.68	\$4,964.88
Sacramento	4	1,166	\$3,159.84	\$4,693.02
San Benito	1	39	\$4,547.28	\$4,727.13
San Bernardino	5	11,410	\$537.84	\$568.70
San Diego	4	6,307	\$1,504.22	\$2,491.50
San Francisco	7	1,985	\$1,246.29	\$1,246.29
San Joaquin	3	1,439	\$1,430.96	\$1,430.96
San Luis Obispo	2	655	\$1,241.99	\$1,756.15
San Mateo	9	1,722	\$1,141.47	\$2,323.38
Santa Barbara	3	3,771	\$345.83	\$562.54
Santa Clara	6	8,711	\$581.30	\$606.10
Santa Cruz	2	380	\$2,134.28	\$2,372.84
Shasta	4	871	\$642.65	\$730.99
Siskiyou	1	261	\$518.45	\$537.84
Solano	4	1,395	\$938.16	\$969.65
Sonoma	9	754	\$1,969.90	\$2,018.86
Stanislaus	3	939	\$1,689.11	\$1,956.03
Sutter	3	121	\$2,326.32	\$3,153.31
Tehama	1	44	\$4,306.95	\$4,306.95
Trinity	1	39	\$1,108.72	\$1,149.59
Tulare	3	1,458	\$888.29	\$912.63
Tuolumne	1	67	\$2,694.55	\$2,793.06
Ventura	7	2,182	\$1,158.72	\$1,388.09
Yolo	3	129	\$4,555.61	\$4,630.71
Yuba	2	138	\$1,551.34	\$1,551.34
TOTALS	172	95,641	\$1,198.23	\$1,200.81

APPENDIX C: Change in County Arrest Rates per 100,000 Juveniles Age 10-17

County	Baseline	(Year)	Expectation	Current (2006)	Change	Meet/Exceed Expectations
Alameda	4962	(2000)	Decrease	3618	-1344	Yes
Amador	5250	(2005)	No Change	3960	-1290	Yes
Butte	5815	(2005)	Increase	6390	575	Yes
Calaveras	5050	(2005)	Decrease	5796	746	No
Colusa	4140	(2005)	Increase	3361	-779	Yes
Contra Costa	2870	(2005)	Decrease	3221	351	No
Del Norte	5466	(2005)	No Change	4005	-1461	Yes
El Dorado	3613	(2005)	Decrease	3641	28	No
Fresno	5889	(2005)	Decrease	6326	437	No
Glenn	14133	(2005)	Decrease	15629	1496	No
Humboldt	5648	(2005)	Decrease	7154	1506	No
Imperial	3856	(2005)	Increase	3384	-472	Yes
Inyo	3640	(2005)	No Change	2749	-891	Yes
Kern	4923	(2005)	No Change	5799	876	No
Kings	14034	(2005)	No Change	14607	573	No
Lake	6077	(2005)	No Change	7063	986	No
Lassen	4984	(2005)	Decrease	4370	-614	Yes
Los Angeles	4416	(2005)	Decrease	4724	308	No
Madera	3373	(2005)	Increase	3502	129	Yes
Marin	6441	(2005)	Decrease	7193	752	No
Mariposa	5034	(2005)	No Change	1761	-3273	Yes
Mendocino	6505	(2005)	Decrease	6738	233	No
Merced	7430	(2005)	No Change	8540	1110	No
Modoc	2424	(2005)	Decrease	1821	-603	Yes
Mono	1151	(2005)	No Change	1518	367	No
Monterey	5821	(2005)	No Change	5637	-184	Yes
Napa	3789	(2005)	Decrease	3006	-783	Yes
Nevada	7781	(2005)	No Change	6350	-1431	Yes
Orange	6646	(1997)	Decrease	3768	-2878	Yes
Placer	4179	(2005)	No Change	4114	-65	Yes
Plumas	13318	(2005)	Increase	11667	-1651	No
Riverside	3358	(2005)	Decrease	3821	463	No
Sacramento	3830	(2005)	No Change	4046	216	No
San Benito	4568	(2005)	No Change	5710	1142	No
San Bernardino	6608	(2005)	No Change	6885	277	No
San Diego	5109	(2005)	Decrease	5307	198	No
San Francisco	4196	(2005)	No Change	5071	875	No
San Joaquin	7398	(2005)	Decrease	7204	-194	Yes
San Luis Obispo	4305	(2005)	Decrease	4166	-139	Yes
San Mateo	3916	(2005)	No Change	3760	-156	Yes
Santa Barbara	7609	(2005)	Increase	8203	594	Yes
Santa Clara	6268	(2005)	No Change	6276	8	No
Santa Cruz	5753	(2005)	Decrease	5793	40	No
Shasta	7850	(2005)	No Change	6631	-1219	Yes
Siskiyou	6006	(2005)	No Change	5556	-450	Yes
Solano	7851	(2005)	Decrease	10420	2569	No
Sonoma	5229	(2005)	Increase	5961	732	Yes
Stanislaus	5271	(2005)	Decrease	5639	368	No
Sutter	5625	(2005)	Increase	6067	442	Yes
Tehama	5098	(2005)	Decrease	5431	333	No
Trinity	4232	(2005)	No Change	6791	2559	No
Tulare	6177	(2005)	No Change	6354	177	No
Tuolumne	6430	(2005)	No Change	6000	-430	Yes
Ventura	5939	(2005)	Decrease	6952	1013	No
Yolo	4370	(2005)	Decrease	5260	890	No
Yuba	5093	(2005)	No Change	3372	-1721	Yes
All JJCPA Counties	4869	(2005)		5168	299	

Source data for Arrest Rates: Criminal Justice Center, California Department of Justice